

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

Claims 4 and 21 are currently being canceled.

Claims 1, 5, 18 and 22 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This response amends and cancels claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending and canceling the claims as set forth above, claims 1-3, 5-20 and 22-36 are now pending in this application.

Request for entry of After-final Amendment and Reply:

It is respectfully requested that this after-final Amendment and Reply be considered and entered, since it does not raise any new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. The features added to independent claims 1 and 18 were previously presented in claims 5 and 18 (now canceled), respectively.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 and 18-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,577,172 to Vatland et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,373,585 to Mastie; and claims 6-17 and 23-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vatland et al. in view of Mastie, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,891,632 to Schwartz. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims, for at least the reasons given below.

In its rejection of claim 4, whereby those features are now incorporated into presently pending independent claim 1, the Office Action asserts that column 6, lines 29-31 of Mastie teaches that an enable file 32 allows the user to specify how much of the printer controller processing cycles are dedicated to RIPping operation. Irrespective as to whether or not this is true, it is not pertinent to the features recited in claim 1, whereby it is the processing performance of the print client that is what the RIP distribution control means uses to distribute the raster image processing, and not the processing performance of the printer controller.

Accordingly, presently pending claim 1 is patentable over the cited art of record.

Presently pending independent claim 18 has been amended to include the features of now-canceled claim 21, wherein those features are similar to the features of claim 4 that were added to claim 1. Thus, claim 18 is also patentable over the cited art of record.

With respect to its rejection of claim 7, the Office Action asserts that Figure 4 of Vatland discloses a plurality of print client members by virtue of its Computer System 70 and Computer System 72. However, claim 7 recites that the selected print client member uses its own RIP function part, thus mandating that each of the print client members have an RIP function part. In Figure 4 of Vatland, on the other hand, only Computer System 72 has a RIP part 136, while Computer System 70 does not have the capability of performing RIP processing.

Accordingly, since the other cited art of record does not rectify the above-mentioned deficiencies of Vatland, claim 7 is separately patentable over the cited art of record for these additional reasons.

Claim 26 recites features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 7, and thus claim 26 is also separately patentable over the cited art of record for these additional reasons.

With respect to the rejection of claims 35 and 36, the Office Action asserts that column 7, lines 16-30 of Vatland discloses the features recited in those claims. Applicants

respectfully disagree. In claims 35 and 36, an RIP module is downloaded from the printer controller to the print client member, whereby the RIP module is the module that performs RIP processing.

In column 7, lines 16-30 of Vatland, on the other hand, a selected printer provides media and ink information from the printer's profile information module, whereby a print client can then review that information to adjust for media and ink differences between printers to produce corrected raster image data. No transfer of an RIP module is performed in this portion of Vatland; rather, only print information is provided from a printer to a print client.

Accordingly, claims 35 and 36 are separately patentable over the cited art of record for these additional reasons.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the final Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition 00 for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date April 7, 2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Phillip J. Articola

Pavan K. Agarwal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,888

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819